

Judge Nortoni Refused to Be Led Back Into the Republican Party After Unsparingly Condemning and Criticising It as a Member of the National Progressive Platform Committee in 1912.

In a masterful speech delivered before thousands at the State Fair recently, Judge Nortoni eloquently and earnestly gave his reasons for supporting President Wilson in the present campaign. He spoke in part as follows:

I am not a Republican, neither am I a Democrat. I come as a Progressive. I am speaking this year for precisely the same principles and policies I supported four years ago. A friend of mine said to me: "You have changed your politics." I said, "No, I continue as a Progressive and intend to participate with others in the reorganization of the Progressive party in the future." My case is similar to that of the Indian who was discovered wandering in the woods by a friendly frontiersman. The frontiersman said to the Indian: "Are you lost?" And the Indian replied: "No; Indian no lost; wigwam lost." This is my situation.



JUDGE ALBERT D. NORTONI.

uation precisely, while the home and some others are lost for the time being.

Acting upon principle, I separated from the Republican and participated in the organization of the Progressive party because my conscience forbade that I should longer affiliate with the party used as an instrument of government in behalf of large interests enjoying special privileges at the expense of the whole people. The movement for a new party not only appealed to my judgment, but it aroused an enthusiasm within me to a degree which I had never before experienced. I was chairman of the first state convention in Missouri and with the lamented Col. Nelson of the Kansas City Star attended the national convention as a delegate-at-large. At Chicago I was made a member of the committee on platform and co-laborer with the excellent men of that body formulating what I regard as the greatest declaration of principles and policies given forth by any political assembly of my day. On my return to Missouri I was unanimously chosen as the candidate of the new party for Governor, and after a short campaign of the state we polled 125,000 votes. Many of us were entirely sincere and embraced the cause for the betterment of conditions generally with lofty motives and purity of purpose. I was one of this number and believed, for I was given to so understand, that we were engaged in building a permanent party that should go forward and upward in the task of reclaiming the powers of government from the great interests of the country, and lodging them again in the hands of all the people, where they justly reside.

In our contract with the people we not only declared our purpose not to further aid the continuance of invisible government in its maneuverings through such men as Penrose, Smoot, Barnes, Crane, Guggenheim and others, but we solemnly agreed to dethrone it, that the people's government might be administered by and for them.

Having enlisted in this splendid cause, I, for one, was politically happy for the first time in my life, and this, too, though it was well understood that we would not be able to come into office and power until the old Republican machine was completely destroyed and the new party established on the ruins of the old, but in accord with the spirit of Lincoln. All of us shared the promise that the "men and women" thus gathered together "would never be abandoned." It may be regarded as certain, according to the thought of candid persons everywhere, that those of us who affiliated with the new party in good faith were justified in believing, at least, that we would not be abandoned on the very center of the field when the flag was floating high and the bugle call but sounded. But, be this as it may, the fact speaks for itself. History will record and characterize it. As chairman of the Missouri delegation, I was present at the passing of the party and witnessed it with solemnity and sadness similar in degree to the feeling of happiness experienced at its birth.

Here I found myself a political orphan, recognizing no obligation to any party but owing an allegiance to my country. Which, according to conscience, compels me to function, as a citizen somewhere and somehow.

It is obvious that the same crowd of reactionary leaders constitute the works of the Republican party now as before. In 1912 these men were forced to steal delegates to control the Republican convention, and in 1916, the Progressives having moved out, they controlled the situation without opposition, for all were of one accord. In this situation it devolved upon them to nominate a candidate who would

appear to be Progressive in order to consummate the plan so manifestly pre-arranged to destroy the Progressive party and seize, almost as by force, its membership to be utilized in rehabilitating the old Republican organization to the end that the invisible government may again be secure in its place and the army of officeholders once more be triumphantly installed in authority. In this view, Mr. Hughes was introduced with much acclaim, not as a progressive, but as an anti-boss candidate. Is it thought for a moment that Barnes, Penrose, Crane, Smoot and others, who controlled the Republican convention this summer, would accept a Progressive? If so, then why did not Cummins or some others of that school fare better? Everyone who meditates upon it knows that these men understand the fundamental distinction lies in the mental attitude in respect to the rights of property and the rights of men. The Progressives believe in the principle declared in the Declaration of Independence to the effect that all men are created free and equal, and as such are possessed of certain inalienable rights, among which are those of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that it is the chief office of government to secure and protect these. The other school of thought adheres to the old Tory doctrine or aristocratic view that property and wealth accord a special privilege to the owner and a special right. Emanating from this fundamental distinction in the two schools of thought, there arises every day and hour of our existence a conflict between the rights of humanity on the one hand and those of property on the other. Mr. Lincoln, whose spirit dominated the Republican party at one time, stood for the rights of humanity as against those of property; and this, too, was the doctrine of Thomas Jefferson. So it was the Progressive platform of 1912 employed the names of these two great friends of the people conjunctively in declaring our doctrine. Such alone was the great fundamental of the Progressive movement, and the matter of the opposition to bosses and boss control was but a mere incident in the fight for human rights, and this because the crooked special interests which seek to control the governmental agencies in the interests of property first and relegate human rights to the second place usually attain their ends through the activity of the bosses who acquire political power for the purpose of financial reward. Concede that Gov. Hughes opposed Boss Barnes, and still he appears as a reactionary rather than as a Progressive. Gov. Hughes vetoed the two-cent fare law in the populous state of New York, where more persons ride on the railroads than in any other four states in the Union. And this, too, on mere opinion that it was confiscatory in that it diminished the earnings of property, and without an investigation as to the fact, though the rights of men and women who paid the railroad fares were involved as well. He also vetoed the law fixing the salary of women teachers who performed the like services as men, although the matter of human rights was involved and the elemental precepts of social justice called aloud for vindication. Likewise, he vetoed the full-crew bill in the interests of the railroad properties, though its operation lessened the burden of the tollers and rendered more secure the lives of those in transportation.

In the view that it is the office of government to protect property, the enlightened opinion of the country has long since settled upon the proposition in favor of an income tax, for it is proper that one who possesses a large income, say representing a million, whether in property or genius, should contribute more to the support of the government which protects him in its enjoyment than the man of lesser means who really enjoys but a slight measure of protection regarded with reference to his meager portion. The Congress passed and submitted to the state legislatures for ratification the income tax amendment and Gov. Hughes sent a message to the legislature of his state in opposition to it, and in this he advanced reasons commonly put forward by the big business and reactionary crowd, William Barnes and others. The position thus assumed was in favor of property and inimical to the rights of humanity at large, from whom the proposal was designed to lift a considerable burden of taxation. So it is, we see, that Mr. Hughes, as said recently in flaming headlines in the Chicago Tribune, the leading standpat Republican organ of the west, is satisfactory to Wall Street. Far be it from me to even suggest that Mr. Hughes is not an honest man. The point of the matter is that, even though honest, he is a creature of the environment in which he developed. A typical New York lawyer, who won his way in the mart of big business, he lives and moves and has his being as big business lives and moves and has its being. The same is true, on the other hand, of one who comes from the slums. He is a creature of his environment, and his mental attitude partakes from those sources and is fixed by the circumstances and customs surrounding his development. How frequently in the history of the country have we seen the basest men who have served the railroads, for instance, for 20 years as counsel, been elevated to the federal bench and in the trial of a case in court how frequently the country observes and candid persons complain that such judges, though honest, can see with clear vision the railroad's view of the case and are positively dull to the side involving the interests of society as a whole. This is because of the environment in which one has developed rather than from fault. But, though such be true, the evil re-

sult is the same, for, while such a judge may be regarded as safe and sane by those special interests, the vision is a narrow one when regarded from the standpoint of all the people. So it is we find Mr. Hughes satisfactory to Wall Street, because his mental attitude squares with the view of big business rather than the Progressive view that this country belongs to the people who inhabit it, and that they have a right to control its affairs and enjoy the full measure of the rights declared in the Declaration of Independence.

Although the contest for human rights has been waged in the country for several years past, the records disclose that Mr. Hughes has not even been sufficiently interested to cast his vote for six years, and though he now, as 100 per cent candidate, declares he favors the suffrage for the women, it appears he was not sufficiently interested in his state on this vital question of human rights. Over against this we see President Wilson, the progressive, a man whose kindly, sympathetic mental attitude is as different from that of Mr. Hughes as was that of Abraham Lincoln from men of the character of Penrose and Barnes. Mr. Wilson always votes, and, though constantly engaged with his huge legislative program, and in steering the ship of state midst the flaming waves of war on every hand so as to maintain the happiness of his country, at least found time to go to his state and give his vote on the side of human rights toward enfranchising the women of New Jersey. Indeed, on looking into the matter I discovered Mr. Hughes' mental attitude to be that of the reactionary type, while Mr. Wilson stood as a progressive.

There is a dual leadership in both of the old political parties. Barnes, Penrose, Crane, Smoot and others, who dominate and control the Republican party organization, it is well known, are in alliance with the big business interests of the country, to conserve and protect them at all hazards, notwithstanding the interests of the plain people. On the other hand, there are certain gentlemen in the Republican party, such as Senators LaFollette, Cummins, Kenyon, Clapp and others, who represent the Progressive view and frequently stand, when a conflict of interest arises between the rights of humanity and those of property, on the side of the people. But the old reactionary crowd controls the Republican party as an instrument of government. There is not and there can be no distinction as to the honesty and high purpose of the men and women who constitute the membership of the Republican party, the Democratic party, the Progressive and other parties. In speaking of political parties we intend only the party as used as an instrument of government; that is, through which good people are affiliated together, following after one leadership or another in whatever direction those leaders may lead, according to their bent of mind. There are likewise two leaderships in the Democratic party. Charles F. Murphy of Tammany Hall and others represent the same interests in the Democratic party as do those first named in the Republican party, while President Wilson and those who co-operate with him represent the Progressive view. At the moment, however, it appears that the old reactionary crowd is in control of the Republican party and dictates its policies and affairs, while Mr. Wilson and those who adhere to his views dominate the Democratic party; that is to say the progressive element of the Democratic party is clearly in the ascendancy and directs the course of the party as an instrument of government under the leadership of Mr. Wilson. As evidence of this it is necessary to do no more than cite the progressive legislative accomplishments of Democracy under Mr. Wilson's leadership.

One of the leading features of the Progressive platform in 1912 was our plank demanding a revision of the currency and banking laws so as to introduce a degree of elasticity in the matter of our currency. Under the old banking law the money was gotten out of the treasury by men who had a certain character of bonds to deposit therefor, under the pretext of moving the crops a time or two each year. As a rule, some 12 to 20 New York financiers controlled the securities essential to draw the currency from the treasury, and by this means they acquired control of the great volume of our circulating medium. Having acquired this control, they would let it out as they chose. It was in their power to either expand or contract the currency as they saw fit and send the prices up and down at the expense of the whole people. It was also within their power to start a panic as they saw fit, and as everyone knows, they did start the John Smith panic at the close of the Roosevelt administration to crush him and to eliminate him as a possible political factor of the future. The Progressive party declared against the central bank idea advocated by Aldrich and the control of the currency by the few and in favor of the decentralization plan. President Wilson took the matter up immediately after his election, and through strenuous efforts over the unending opposition of certain New York financiers, who had theretofore enjoyed the special privilege, finally induced the Congress to enact and he signed the federal reserve law. This, in my judgment, is the greatest piece of legislation in favor of the business of the country which has been written on the statute books in 50 years.

Because Mr. Wilson saw and apprehended this situation and administered the Progressive idea in relieving it, I give as one of the reasons why I am for his re-election.

The Progressive platform declared in favor of a system of rural credits which insured to the benefit of the farmers and those engaged in agriculture. The President persuaded Congress to take up the idea and to enact it into law, and this accomplishment is known as the rural credits act. The principal features of the rural credits act provide that the farmer may borrow from the government, through the regional farm loan bank and an association nearer his home, not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of his land and 20 per cent of the value of his buildings for the purpose of paying for his home or acquiring other land or

means of utilizing it, and in no case shall the rate of interest exceed 6 per cent on such loans. It may be as low as 4, 4½ or 5 per cent, but not exceeding 6 per cent. I cite this as a second reason why I favor the re-election of President Wilson.

The Progressive platform declared, too, for the amendment of the anti-trust laws, and the President took up this matter with the Congress and urged it until the Clayton law was passed. Because the President recognized and contended for this fundamental principle that labor is a part of life, rather than a commodity, which principle is so essential to the social welfare of the country, and so humane and so kindly in its import, I will give him my vote in November.

We Progressives declared for a tariff commission in the view that the tariff should be taken out of politics entirely. Everyone knows that the making up of the tariff had fallen into hands which manipulated it so as to grant special privileges to some favored persons and inequalities to others. The Payne-Aldrich tariff law was the climax of the old grab-bag fashion of making up the tariff, and it was so obnoxious that more than one-half of the party that enacted it condemned it. The Progressives in their platform advanced the proposition that the tariff should be removed from politics entirely, in the view that it was purely a business question; therefore, we favored a non-partisan, scientific tariff commission which should be charged with the duty of investigating the facts as to the difference in the cost of production in this country and in foreign countries, with a view of ascertaining a true and an equitable measure, after which the duties on particular schedules might be fashioned. The proposal did not necessarily mean protection, but it meant justice. In some cases a protective tariff, of course, would essentially be the result of the investigation where articles were produced cheaper in foreign countries than here because of the lesser wages paid on the other side than here. In other cases it might mean no protection whatever. If it should appear that it cost more to produce particular articles in other countries than here, so their importation might not result in beating down our prices. The proposal was so eminent-ly just that even the Republican party this year has adopted it and written it into its platform. President Wilson, however, was in the advance as to this, for he declared in favor of it a year ago. The Democratic party, too, has written the same proposal into its platform, but Mr. Wilson and his party have the advantage in point of performance, for under his leadership the Democratic party has already enacted our Progressive tariff commission into law. And so it is, if the two parties be sincere, the tariff is removed entirely from the arena as a political question and is to be treated in the future according to the Progressive plan along the lines of intelligent business principles. This is another reason why I am in favor of Mr. Wilson, because, forsooth, he not only saw and understood the justice of our proposal, but persuaded his party to actually enact it into law.

The Progressive platform declared in favor of the eight-hour day principle in continuous industries, and some three or four different portions of that document reflect this view. Impending controversy between the railroad employees and the owners of the railroads came up this summer. The men demanded an eight-hour day and pay and a half for overtime. The owners of the railroads rejected these demands and proposed an arbitration. The railroad men refused to arbitrate and insisted upon their right to have an eight-hour day.

The President said, as the enlightened opinion of society has settled the question of an eight-hour day as right, it wasn't one for arbitration, but, indeed, as a matter of positive right should never be so submitted. The owners of the railroads should be submitted, and their proposal amounts to the same thing as in case one who should violate the Sunday laws would insist upon the matter of arbitrating the question in respect to this. The better thought of the world has settled long ago upon the proposition that it is right to observe one day in seven as a holy day, and this is true, whatever our religious views may be. The matter having been thus sanctioned by the concurrence of public opinion, it is established as a right and therefore removed from the field of discussion as to propriety and likewise the purview of arbitration. The President was clearly right, according to the best thought of the world as to this, and he proposed, too, that the other matter in dispute—that is, the pay for overtime—should be considered after an investigation of the facts, not according to the opinion of either the owners of the railroads or the men. To do this it was essential that some investigation should be had to ascertain what would appear to be a just compensation for the overtime, and how great the burden would be on the railroads touching that matter. In so far as the President denied the application of the principle of arbitration as to the eight-hour day, he stood squarely on the Progressive platform and squarely in accord with the settled judgment of society throughout the country. But, as no agreement could be reached, the question was laid before Congress, and the charge is made that force was used to obtain the enactment of the President's proposal into law. This may be answered, first, by denying the fact. No force was used. The attempt to agree having been abandoned, the men called a strike to go into effect a very few days thereafter. Thereupon the railroads issued an embargo against receiving for transportation certain kinds of freight—an appalling condition was threatened. The railroad men called the strike and departed from Washington. They used no force on Congress and asked no legislation touching the matter. They simply asserted their right under the recognized law of this country to quit the employment, either individually or collectively, as they chose. The President represented the third party to the controversy; that is, the great general public—the one hundred million of Americans on whom the blow would fall. To tie up the arteries of transportation thus would

entail a loss so far reaching in its effects that one may not conceive the result in the fullness of its measure. The man who had cattle or hogs on his farm to ship would be required to keep them while he could not reach the market. The wheat crops of the farmer would decompose in the field. The melon crops of southeast Missouri, the cabbage crops, the peach crops, and so, too, all of the crops would perish for want of means to transport them to market. The factories would shut down because, forsooth, it was impossible to transport their goods to the consumer. In this situation the factories would close down and the men in their employ be thrown into idleness rather than to permit the accumulation of goods which might not be transported into the marts of trade, and with the closing down of the factories, the banking of the fires in the furnaces, the coal mines would likewise suspend and the miners unemployed, for the coal would neither be required to generate the heat necessary in propelling the machinery, nor could it be transported if removed from the earth. The same situation would obtain in respect to the products of the iron mines, the zinc mines, and the lead mines, and the heavy hand of disaster and ruin would fall alike on every department of industry, both in the cities and the agricultural districts of the country.

This was the situation confronting the President, and was the viewpoint fully conceived and apprehended by Mr. Wilson as the presiding genius in guiding and conserving the affairs of a hundred million American people. In this situation he presented the matter to Congress and requested immediate action, and this, too, in the high spirit of justice, for he requested only a declaration of the eight hour principle as an arbitrary rule which has been accepted by the judgment of mankind as right. The President averted the strike and saved the country from disaster and temporary ruin. I take my stand on the side of President Wilson and shall lift my voice in his defense.

The situation presented was extraordinary in character. The remedy applied to avert such a threatened disaster was, in my judgment, not only appropriate and just, but it in no sense partakes of the character of legislation forced by anyone.

However, it is important in considering this matter to look at the records as to how the law was passed. In the house of representatives there were 78 Republicans, including ex-Speaker Cannon, who voted for the bill and only 56 votes were against it. These men go before the people of the country every two years for election, and they knew the proposal was just; they therefore voted, without regard to party lines, in favor of the President's proposition. But, when the bill came into the senate, where the members are elected every six years, a somewhat different situation was presented.

It was sought to raise a political issue in order to aid in the shaking down of a large campaign fund and rehabilitate, if possible, the old Republican machine which at all times represents the invisible government behind the scenes. We find in the Senate but two Democratic senators (neither of these are from Missouri), voting against the proposal. The President's party, save two senators, supported it; but, on looking over the vote of the Republican senators it is different. We see Senator La Follette only, the splendid old Progressive from Wisconsin, who has never faltered but always stands for the Progressive policies, voting with the Democrats for President Wilson's proposal and aiding in its passage. Over against this there is the heavy old reactionary senators headed by Penrose and Gallinger, and co-operating with them are such men as Borah, Grana, Cummins, Kenyon and Clapp, who ordinarily are Progressives, following the leadership of Penrose and Gallinger in their alignment on the side of property, rather than on the side of humanity, for they voted against the law.

The Progressive platform of 1912 declared in favor of a child labor law, and the kind heart of Mr. Wilson was touched by this matter so that he, too, accepted the Progressive view as to it. Do you know that there are two million little children employed in this country, in the mills and the factories, and the mines, at a very slight wage, but they render a service to their employers which yields an enormous profit because the labor is so much cheaper than that of adult labor? Because of this, certain interests desire to exploit the labor of little children, and this, too, notwithstanding the result entailed upon the child itself. Every thoughtful person understands that the child and youthful person exposes himself or herself to danger frequently in a thoughtless manner, merely because thoughtlessness and indiscretion are incident to child-life. In other words, a mature person may be able to protect himself against thoughtless acts and conduct, whereas, a mere child will encounter dangers through thoughtlessness because such is inherent in the child and cannot be obviated. It is the high duty of government to interpose in the protection of innocence and helplessness. Little children toiling in the factories, and the mills, and the mines, frequently lose their little hands; their little legs; their little eyes. Their little lives are crushed out; because, forsooth, in the very web and woof of their being there exists that indiscretion which they are helpless to withstand. The President persuaded the Democratic leaders that the voice of justice called for its enactment and having persuaded, he induced them to place it upon the calendar and carry it into the law, which was done, and he signed it. As for me, his splendid, high progressive and humane attitude on this matter alone would compel me, and ought to compel all true Progressives, to vote for him in November.

This splendid legislative accomplishment, finding its source largely in the Progressive platform, ought to induce the votes of sincere Progressives everywhere.

The attitude of President Wilson's mind is disclosed beyond question to be that of a Progressive, who, in every conflict between property and humanity, stands first on the side of human rights, while the mental attitude of Mr. Hughes, as disclosed by his offi-

cial acts, reveals equally as clearly that he takes his position on the side of large property, where the conflict occurs, in preference to that of humanity.

Much has been said touching the President's foreign policy. There were times when I was somewhat uneasy and thought things were moving too slowly, but the President was engaged in keeping us out of war. In so far as the foreign policy as to Germany is concerned, the President won his point. The submarine warfare was finally discontinued, and I am free to acknowledge that whatever I may have thought on the subject, I was wrong and the President was right. He steered the Ship of State safely through, kept us out of war with Germany, and preserved the peace with honor. The only way we may say whether or not we have been dishonored and as to whether we hang our heads in shame, as Mr. Hughes says, is to consult our own consciences touching the matter. I believe I am an average citizen. I feel no dishonor in the least from the fact that my country has enjoyed profound peace while the larger portion of the world was at war. It was said that some of the Germans who sympathized, as is proper enough, with the Fatherland, feel unkindly toward President Wilson, and why so is something more than I could understand. If America had become involved in war with Germany, as many would have us, this fact alone, added to the present situation, would certainly overwhelm and crush the German empire. It is due to President Wilson alone and his high and noble efforts to keep us at peace that we have not been plunged into war with Germany, and for this reason every German sympathizer should feel grateful to him. But this matter is beside the case for a satisfactory agreement appears to have been reached between the administration and Germany as to the submarine warfare and it has ceased.

Much is said of the Mexican situation. When the facts concerned are analyzed it seems to me to be preposterous to talk about our intervention there.

President Wilson has sought to keep this country at peace with Mexico, and has sought at the same time not to interfere with the rights of the Mexican people, to overthrow the government which exploits them and to establish a new constitutional government which will insure them the protection of property and the fullest measure of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Certain large interests in this country have for a few paltry thousands of dollars acquired concessions and property rights in Mexico, and these insist upon our government intervening there to protect their property. President Wilson has justly assumed the Progressive side, for he says he will not deny the right of the Mexican people to revolution with a view of throwing off an oppressive government and establishing one on constitutional lines in favor of the whole. I fully agree with his position. But it is said that the President should have recognized Huerta. Huerta was the general of the constitutionalists. In the army, and under the laws of Mexico he succeeded to the presidency on the death of the President and Vice-President. It stands conceded that Huerta occasioned the assassination and the murder of those between himself and the presidency so he could succeed to the office. This being true, President Wilson declined, as the representative of a hundred million God-fearing people here, to recognize him. He felt such a course to be an immoral one and not representative of the high and holy thought of his country. In this I agree. But, it is said, having sent the fleet to Vera Cruz to enforce a salute of our flag, he humiliated us in withdrawing it without enforcing the salute. When the facts are examined it seems to me that this is almost ridiculous.

Much complaint is made as to the bandit raids across our borders. These bandits are not representing the Mexican government in their raids, but rather they are representing themselves as our bandits in Missouri—the James boys, and the Youngers, and others did after the war. Wherever a condition of war obtains, as in Mexico, the rules of conduct and law and order are ipso facto suspended so that vicious characters may rule with a high hand. We know this from our own experience in this state. We know that after the Civil War was settled for nearly 25 years we were infested with bandits here, who marauded generally, robbing banks and trains, and all the powers of the state of Missouri, though often employed, were unable to suppress them. These were the conditions that obtain in Mexico. It is certain that President Wilson has had more difficult problems to confront him, and with which to deal, than any President we have ever had from the days of Washington until the present time, save Mr. Lincoln alone. Notwithstanding this, he has steered the Ship of State safely mid the turmoil of the warring nations of the world, and has kept us at peace.

There are but two sides to this question. Mr. Wilson and his party stands for peace. Those who take the other side essentially stand for the only opposite, and that is war, or intervention in Mexico, which means war.

Tonight we have the family circle intact. There is around the table the father, the mother, the three sons and the two daughters. If we are drawn into a conflict of arms with Mexico or any other country it means that our proud and best young men are called to the front to perform military service, and it means, too, that some of them will return home with one arm, some with one limb, some will return home blinded and crippled for life; others are returned home in their caskets to be buried and to receive the last sad rites to be performed by neighbors and friends, while others are never seen again by the parents who have brought them into life, fondled them in childhood, and developed them into vigorous young men to go forward and perform the citizenship of the future.

So far as I am concerned, I stand for the policies of Mr. Wilson, who has preserved the peace, and will continue to preserve the peace, and may the God who blesses the Peacemaker bless him and insure his re-election in November.